



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,082	11/29/2001	Laszlo Hars	US010203	4368
24737	7590	02/06/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			ELISCA, PIERRE E	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			3621	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/998,082	HARS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pierre E. Elisca	3621

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's RCE filed on 01/06/2006.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Philips US 2002/0107802A1.

As per claim 1, Philips discloses a method of downloading music over the internet, comprising;

Identifying content to be downloaded by inputting the content to a processing device [processing device or microprocessor 52, fig 1] see., abstract, page 1-page3, Phillips discloses Applicant's newly added limitation in fig 1, item 52, specifically page 3 wherein said CPU 52 processes the data under the control of an operating system.... Therefore, the processing device is readable as a CPU for processing data);

Partitioning the content using a program executed by the processing device (or microprocessor 52, fig 1) into at least two sections wherein each of the at least two sections has a duration which is less than a threshold duration value assigned by the screening algorithm (see., abstract, pages 1-8. It is inherent to recognize that each AUDIO/VIDEO has a plurality of sections (sections or tracks). Also, each section or track has a time duration);

Subjecting the partitioned content to the screening algorithm (see., abstract, pages 1-8, algorithm or encryption).

As per claims 2 and 3, Philips discloses the claimed method wherein the screening algorithm is a secure digital music initiative screening algorithm see., abstract, pages 1-8, algorithm or encryption).

As per claim 4, Philips discloses the claimed method wherein the content is downloaded from the internet (see., page 2).

6. Claims 1-5, and 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Tagawa et al US 2005/0010795 A1.

As per claims 1-15 Tagawa discloses a digital data recording medium, comprising;

Identifying content to be downloaded by inputting the content to a processing device (or host computer or PC 201, page 4, [0065, page 9, [0129]]) see., abstract, page 1-page15;

Partitioning the content into at least two sections wherein each of the at least two sections has a duration which is less than a threshold duration value assigned by the screening algorithm (see., abstract, pages 1-16. It is inherent to recognize that each AUDIO/VIDEO has a plurality of sections (sections or tracks). Also, each section or track has a time duration);

Subjecting the partitioned content to the screening algorithm (see., abstract, pages 1-16, algorithm or encryption).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

REMARKS

8. In response to Applicant's arguments, Applicant has stated that:
a. neither Philips nor disclose partitioning downloaded content into at least two sections

wherein each of the at least two sections has a duration that is less than a threshold duration value. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion since Philips and Tagawa disclose this limitation in pages 1-8.

b. each section or track of a recorded item has a time duration. As indicated above, it is inherent to recognize that each AUDIO/VIDEO has a plurality of sections (sections or tracks). Also, each section or track has a time duration.

c. Applicant also argues that Philips fails to disclose the step of “downloading by inputting the content to a processing device” (processing device or microprocessor 52, fig 1). However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion since Philips discloses this limitation in the abstract, page 1-page3, specifically wherein said CPU 52 processes the data under the control of an operating system.... Therefore, the processing device is readable as a CPU for processing data).

d. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Tagawa fails to disclose the step of “downloading by inputting the content to a processing device (processing device or Host computer or PC 201)”. As noted in the previous rejection and hereby incorporated by reference, the cited reference Tagawa discloses this limitation in page 4, [0065, page 9, [0129]] see., abstract, page 1-page15.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 571 272 6706. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571 272 6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Pierre Eddy Elisca

Primary Patent Examiner

February 03, 2006